

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**I. Introduction**

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-20, 22-26, 28-39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 51-55, 57 and 61-62 and new claims 63- are pending. New claims 63-96 have been added to add claims in a variety of formats. These new claims are allowable for the same general reasons that the previously pending claims were found to be allowable.

This amendment is respectfully submitted in response to the Office Action dated April 18, 2007. The Office Action follows a previously issued Notice of Allowance. In the Office Action, no prior art rejections were made. However, claims 28-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In addition, claims 37-39 were objected to for depending from a rejected base claim but were indicated to be directed to allowable subject matter.

Applicants have amended each of the independent claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 in a manner that the Examiner indicated during the December 11, 2006 telephone discussion summarized below would overcome the §101 rejections. In view of the amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 have been overcome.

Objected to claim 37 has been amended to be in independent form thereby placing it in condition for allowance. Since claims 38-39 which were objected to for

depending from a rejected base claim now depend from allowable claim 37 it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also now in condition for allowance.

II. Interview Summary

On December 11, 2006, the Examiner called and indicated that claims 28-36 would be rejected based under §101 as being directed to unpatentable subject matter but indicated that claim 37 which recited a transmitting step was directed to patentable subject matter because transmitting was a useful, concrete and tangible result. Applicant's representative indicated that Applicant believed that the pending claims were directed to patentable subject matter but that Applicant might be willing to add "communicating a signal including the generated multi-part prefix to a transmitter" to the claims which the Examiner indicated would be rejected under §101. It was submitted that the communicating of a signal including the generated multi-part prefix to a transmitter was a useful, concrete and tangible result similar to the transmitting step the Examiner identified as being acceptable. The Examiner indicated that such an amendment would overcome the §101 rejections which the Examiner indicated would be made. Applicant's undersigned representative requested having until December 15, 2006 to respond to the Examiner's suggestion. On December 18, the Examiner called to follow-up. Applicant's undersigned representative apologized for not getting back to the Examiner and indicated that given the issuance of the Notice of

Allowance, Applicant did not intend to amend the claims unless a new office action was issued but indicated that Applicant would be open to possibly amending the claims along the lines discussed in the event a new office action issued. No prior art was discussed during either of the Examiner initiated discussions which occurred on December 11 and December 18, 2007.

III. The New Claims Are Patentable

New claims 63-67 are allowable for the same or similar reasons claim 1 is allowable.

New claims 72-76 are allowable for the same or similar reasons that claim 12 is allowable.

New claims 77-80 are allowable for the same or similar reasons that claim 18 is allowable.

New claims 81-82 are allowable for the same or similar reasons that claim 28 is allowable.

New claims 83-84 are allowable for the same or similar reasons claim 29 is allowable.

New claim 91 is allowable for the same or similar reasons claim 34 is allowable.

New claims 92-94 are allowable for the same or similar reasons claim 41 is allowable.

New claims 95-96 are allowable for the same or similar reasons claim 51 is allowable.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant requests that the Examiner pass this application to issue. If any issues remain to be resolved the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative by telephone.

In the event that an extension of time may be required or any other fee may be due in regard to this amendment, the fee is authorized to be charged to deposit account 50-1049 of Straub & Pokotylo.

Respectfully submitted,

July 18, 2007

Michael P. Straub
Michael P. Straub, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,941
Tel.: (732) 542-9070

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper (and any accompanying paper(s)) is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent Office on the date shown below.

Michael P. Straub

Type or print name of person signing certification

Michael P. Straub
Signature

July 18, 2007

Date